

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicants cancel claims 1-17, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof, and add new claims 18-33 to more appropriately define the present invention. Claims 18-33 are now pending in this application.

At the outset, Applicants note on that the Office Action Summary sheet (PTOL-326), the Examiner indicated that the certified copies of the priority document for this case had not been received. However, Applicants note that the Notification of Missing Requirements mailed August 30, 2002, indicated that the priority document had been received. Applicants therefore request that the Examiner clarify the status of the priority document in the next Office communication.

In the Office Action,¹ the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-7, 13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Goldman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,917,424); rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Ghirnikar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,381,241); rejected claims 2, 3, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Goldman in view of Laflin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,705,995); rejected claims 4, 5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Goldman in view of Miwa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,204,744); rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Ghirnikar in view of Laflin; rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Goldman in view of Laflin; and rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Goldman in view of Kolls. The Examiner also objected to claims 12 and 14 as dependent upon rejected base claims.

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Since Applicants have canceled claims 1-17, these rejections and objections are moot. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 17-33 are allowable over the applied prior art references for at least the following reasons.

Claim 18 recites a combination including, among other things, “means for determining that the received information-identification is stored in the reception history table” and “information receiving means for receiving the information from the transmitter and writing the received information-identification in the reception history table when the received information-identification is not stored in the reception history table.” The cited prior art references, taken individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest at least these features.

Goldman, for example, merely teaches that control unit 205 may include a memory storage. See col. 11, lines 11-15. Furthermore, the Goldman system performs a pager process that, when a new page (“page b”) is received before a time expires, compares page b with page a. If the two pages match, then page b is considered a duplicate page of page a and is disregarded by the pager. See col. 11, line 62 to col. 12, line 3. However, Goldman’s memory storage does not constitute or suggest Applicants’ claimed “reception history table.” In addition, Goldman does not disclose or suggest an “information receiving means for receiving the information from the transmitter and writing the received information-identification in the reception history table when the received information-identification is not stored in the reception history table,” as recited in claim 18. Accordingly, Goldman does not disclose all of the features of claim 18.

Moreover, none of the other applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 18. For example, Ghirnikar teaches that upon determining that a received message is a duplicate, a wireless communication device replaces a previous message having id X+1 with the newly received message. Col. 5, lines 35-43. This replacement process, however, does not teach or suggest at least an “information receiving means for receiving the information from the transmitter and writing the received information-identification in the reception history table when the received information-identification is not stored in the reception history table,” as recited in claim 18.

The remaining references, which the Examiner applied in relation to the canceled dependent claims, also do not make up for the above deficiencies. For example, Laffin discloses determining whether a received message contains identifying data indicating it was sent by a person belong to a particular category, such as category for business contacts. See col. 7, lines 12-21. Kolls discloses an electronic commerce terminal for conducting credit card, e-mail, e-commerce, and e-business translations from a public transportation vehicle. See col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 3. Miwa discloses using a processing circuit to make a restricted FM broadcast available only when the decoded reception authorization shows reception authorization and no detected errors. See Abstract. None of these references, however, teach or suggest at least an “information receiving means for receiving the information from the transmitter and writing the received information-identification in the reception history table when the received information-identification is not stored in the reception history table,” as recited in claim 18.

New independent claims 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, and 32, while of differing scopes, include similar recitations as allowable claim 18. Furthermore, dependent claims 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, and 31 depend respectively from allowable claims 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, and 32. Therefore, new claims 19-32 are also allowable over the applied prior art references.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 2, 2005

By: Anthony Yulay Reg. No. 53,232
for Richard V. Burgujian
Reg. No. 31,744